

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

MICHAEL SCOTT,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 11-cv-487-JPG-PMF
)	
AMERICAN FAMILY INSURANCE)	
GROUP, SAMUEL SCOTT, and)	
NICHOL SCOTT,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on its own initiative for purposes of case management. Specifically, the Court questions whether it has jurisdiction over this matter.

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. They may exercise jurisdiction only over matters authorized by the Constitution and by statute. *Turner/Ozanne v. Hyman/Power*, 111 F.3d 1312, 1316 (7th Cir. 1997). Moreover, federal courts must police the boundaries of their own jurisdiction. Even absent an objection by a party challenging jurisdiction, they are “obliged to inquire *sua sponte* whenever a doubt arises as to the existence of federal jurisdiction.” *Tylka v. Gerber Prods. Co.*, 211 F.3d 445, 448-49 (7th Cir. 2000) (quoting *Mt. Healthy City Bd. of Educ. v. Doyle*, 429 U.S. 274, 278 (1977)). As such, this Court conducts a rigorous initial review of complaints to ensure that jurisdiction has been properly pled.

In his Complaint (Doc. 2), Plaintiff Michael Scott (“Scott”) has not properly pled diversity of citizenship as a basis for federal jurisdiction. While federal courts have jurisdiction over a civil action between citizens of different states, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1) (2006), Scott alleges he *and* Defendants Samuel and Nichol Scott are citizens of Illinois.

Accordingly, complete diversity of citizenship does not appear to exist.

Being fully advised of the premises, the Court **ORDERS** Scott to **SHOW CAUSE** on or before **June 17, 2011**, why this matter should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Should Scott fail to show adequate cause, the Court will dismiss this matter for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 14, 2011

s/ J. Phil Gilbert
J. PHIL GILBERT
DISTRICT JUDGE